BEST AVAILABLE C



UNITED S1...ES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERÇE Unit d States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO

09/001,643

12/31/97

ALBERT

R

.1431/USW0391

022193

TM02/0410 QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC LAW DEPT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP 1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3800 **DENVER CO 80202**

EXAMINER

HUYNH, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED:

04/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/001,643	ALBERT ET AL.
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2176
Th MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover shet with	the correspond nce address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) di - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	ATION. 17 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a recation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ary period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become ABA	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>17 January 2000</u> .	
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b)	☐ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v	withdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claims are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.		
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. 💲 119		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. ≸ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
application from the Internation	he priority documents have been ronal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim fo	or domestic priority under 35 U.S.C	;. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-7) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper 	0-948) 19) Notice of Ir	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/001,643 Page 2

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 1/17/00 to the application filed on 12/31/97.

2. Claims 1-12 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

- -

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-4, 6-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anand et al. (US Pat No. 5,710,900, 1/20/98) in view of Peters et al. (US Pat No. 5,884,284, 3/16/99).

Regarding independent claim 1, Anand discloses:

- -- a host site connected to at least one user computer terminal via an on-line interconnection, said host site comprising a database for storing the sale information and inventory information, and a processor terminal connected to the on-line interconnection for receiving a user report request and sending reports created in response to the received requests and additional on-line user input (col 1, lines 5-7, 54-67; col 2, lines 1-4; col 2, lines 14-25, 31-34, 39-41; col 9, lines 16-32; col 6, lines 43-67; col 7, lines 1-13, figures 6, 10-11)
- -- a view manager arranged to generate a set of function commands which can be selectively launched by user input to graphically display a list of available views each of which contains a report relating to particular user information stored in a database, create a new view and report, and edit a view and report (col 2, lines 14-25, 31-34, 39-41, figures 6, 10-11)

Anand fails to disclose the database containing the user billing.

Peters discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

-- generating a set of function commands which can be selectively launched by user input to graphically display a list of available views each of which contains a report relating to a particular user information stored in a database, create a new view and report, and edit a view and report (col 6, lines 4-16; col 8, lines 37-53)

-- a data manager arranged to relate data maintained separately from the database and input by a user with the user's billing and inventory data for display as part of a request report (col 1, lines 10-15; col 6, lines 4-12; lines 50-67; col 7, lines 1-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Peters to Anand. As disclosed by Anand, the database that the user accesses to create and edit a report can be any kind of database and the database disclosed in Peters comprises billing and inventory database that allows the creating of billing report over telecommunications.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, the fact that the Smart Report Viewing subsystem allows the user to format text, tables, and graphs in the report as well as add the footer, annotations to the report implies that the view editor receives and implements user editing instructions (disclosed in claim 1).

Regarding claim 3, the system of Anand includes a graphical user interface for the user to interact with the system.

Regarding claim 4, Anand discloses the aggregating method such as add, average, min, max, count to disclose the change in the Smart Report (col 17, lines 65-67; col 18,

lines 1-50). Anand also discloses the drill down command (col 9, lines 16-32, col 10, lines 50-67).

Regarding claim 6, the system of Anand and Peters comprises an Internet connection and web browser.

Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have known that the graphical user interface comprises Java applets and HTML page.

Claims 8-11 are the method for generating an on-line report performed on the system of claims 1-4, therefore rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 5, 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anand and Peters as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Melchione et al. (US Pat No. 5,930,764, 7/27/99).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Anand and Peter do not disclose that the report filter is arranged to receive user define value for use as threshold value to selectively control which database information will be included in a report. Melchione discloses the three-tier-hierarchy provides the "key" at each of the household, customer, and customer levels that satisfy user criteria for queries, views, and reports (col 16, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined. Melchione into Anand and Peters because

Melchione provides the criteria as a threshold to select which data from the database to be included in the report.

Claim 12 is the method to be performed on the system of claim 5, and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Anand does not teach generating an on-line report containing billing and inventory data.

Examiner disagrees. Anand does teach on-line inventory (figures 6, 10-11; col 1, lines 5-8; col 2, lines 1-13). Also, Peter, the reference in combination with Anand, does teach an on-line report containing billing and inventory data (abstract; col 5, lines 62-67 to col 6, lines 11, 40-55).

Applicants also argue that Anand and Peter do not teach or suggest allowing data maintained separately form the data warehouse to be input and displayed on a report.

Examiner disagrees.

Peter does teach allowing data maintained separately form the data warehouse to be input and displayed on a report (col 6, lines 50-55; col 7, lines 1-14). The subscriber information, dwelling information, inventory information, and miscellaneous information are stored separately and include information to be displayed as a part on a report.

'Application/Control Number: 09/001,643

Art Unit: 2176

Page 7

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 308-5403.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

clh

4/2/01

HEATHER R. HERNDON SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100